

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2

3 IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE  
4

5 - - -

6 GREATBATCH LTD.,  
7

8 : CIVIL ACTION  
9 Plaintiff, :  
10 v :  
11 :  
12 AVX CORPORATION, and :  
13 AVX FILTER CORPORATION, :  
14 : NO. 13-723-LPS  
15 Defendants.  
16 - - -

17 Wilmington, Delaware  
18 Monday, November 19, 2018  
19 Telephone Conference  
20

21 - - -

22 BEFORE: HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK, Chief Judge  
23

24 APPEARANCES: - - -  
25

26 FARNAN, LLP  
27 BY: ROSEMARY J. PIERGIOVANNI, ESQ.  
28

29 and  
30

31 HARRIS BEACH, PLLC  
32 BY: JAMES R. MULDOON, ESQ.  
33 (Syracuse, New York)  
34

35 and  
36

37 HARRIS BEACH, PLLC  
38 BY: LAURA W. SMALLY, ESQ.  
39 (Pittsford, New York)  
40

41 Counsel for Greatbatch Ltd.  
42

43 Brian P. Gaffigan  
44 Official Court Reporter  
45

46  
47

48  
49

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2  
3 RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.  
4 BY: ROBERT W. WHETZEL, ESQ., and  
5 JASON JAMES RAWNSLEY, ESQ.

6 and  
7

NUTTER McCLENNEN & FISH, LLP  
BY: RONALD E. CAHILL, ESQ., and  
MICAH W. MILLER, ESQ.  
(Boston, Massachusetts)

8 Counsel for AVX Corporation  
9 and AVX Filter Corporation  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1

- oOo -

2

P R O C E E D I N G S

3

(REPORTER'S NOTE: The following telephone  
conference was held in open court, beginning at 2:47 p.m.)

5

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. This is  
Judge Stark. Who is there, please?

7

MS. PIERGIOVANNI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  
This is Rosemary Piergiovanni from Farnan representing  
Greatbatch. I have on the line with me Jim Muldoon from  
Harris Beach, and Laurie Smalley, also from Harris Beach.

11

THE COURT: Okay.

12

MR. RAWNSLEY: And, Your Honor, this is Jason  
Rawnsley of Richards Layton & Finger for AVX; and I'm joined  
by Robert Whetzel of Richards Layton; and Ron Cahill and  
Micah Miller of Nutter McClellan.

16

THE COURT: I have my court reporter here with  
me. For the record, it is our case of Greatbatch Limited  
versus AVX Corporation, et al, Civil Action No. 13-723-LPS.  
This is the time that I set to talk about two of the motions  
to strike that are pending and were the subject of letter  
briefs.

22

I want to first discuss Greatbatch's motion to  
strike portions of AVX's report related to noninfringing  
alternatives. So let me hear from Greatbatch first on that  
one, please.

1 MS. SMALLEY: This is Laurie Smalley from  
2 Harris Beach, Your Honor, representing Greatbatch. I'll be  
3 addressing the motion to strike.

4 AVX has offered both technical and damages  
5 expert testimony relating to the '095 patent that could have  
6 been offered prior to the first trial on damages in January  
7 26, 2016, but was not disclosed in AVX's expert reports  
8 presented in the first trial. It has also offered testimony  
9 on apportionment not disclose in its original expert reports  
10 represented during the first trial.

11 The Court's Order granting a new trial at Docket  
12 No. 1013 notes that AVX asked for a motion for new trial  
13 based on three grounds: That the 2017 jury verdict that  
14 certain Ingenio FFTs did not infringe the '715 patent  
15 contradicted the assumption upon which the 2016 damages  
16 verdict was based; that because of the general verdict form,  
17 there was no means to extract damages attributed to the '715  
18 patent from the lump sum jury award; and the post-trial  
19 Federal Circuit decision that finally invalidated claims  
20 11 and 13 of the '627 patent provided noninfringing  
21 alternatives that AVX was unable to present to the first  
22 jury.

23 The Court granted AVX a new trial based on  
24 essentially the grounds that were raised. The Court did not  
25 believe the existing damages award could be attributed to

1 specific patents or products, and the Court's Order stated  
2 that it was granting a new trial so a jury could determine  
3 whether platinum pin Ingenio FFTs were noninfringing  
4 alternatives to the '715 patent and because possible  
5 noninfringing alternatives to the '627 patent could exist  
6 and should be presented to the new jury.

7 There was nothing in the Court's Order that  
8 contemplated AVX's new noninfringing alternatives to the  
9 '095 patent or any noninfringing alternatives to the '715  
10 patent other than the noninfringing platinum pin Ingenio  
11 FFTs.

12 THE COURT: Ms. Smalley, let me stop you there  
13 because I think --

14 MS. SMALLEY: Sure.

15 THE COURT: I think the question may actually  
16 be the flip of that, the reverse of that. Where is there  
17 anything that limits what AVX can do in the new expert  
18 discovery that I ordered in connection with the new trial?

19 MS. SMALLEY: Basically, Your Honor, the expert  
20 discovery order does provide for supplemental reports but  
21 it's within the Court's discretion and it's the general  
22 rule that new evidence and exhibits should not be presented  
23 at a second trial outside of if the Court deems a compelling  
24 need, or I think the language is.

25 THE COURT: Right. Now, I have seen those

1 cases, but that is what I wanted to understand. I have  
2 not seen you point me to anything in the opinion granting  
3 the new trial or in the supplemental scheduling order or  
4 anywhere else where I said in this case, I'm going to  
5 exercise my discretion to limit what the expert discovery  
6 is going to be in connection with the new trial. I see the  
7 case is about sort of the general background presumption and  
8 I just wanted to understand are you relying on that general  
9 background presumption or is there something specific that I  
10 have done in this case to limit AVX?

11 MS. SMALLEY: I mean I would obviously defer  
12 to the Court on the interpretation of its own order, but the  
13 order granting a new trial was for a specific purpose. It  
14 wasn't to entitle AVX to redo its damages case.

15 THE COURT: Well, let me better understand that.  
16 I thought that the damages trial is in part due to the fact  
17 that certain of the premises and assumptions that underlie  
18 the earlier damages verdict are no longer operative and  
19 given the general verdict form that we used last time, we  
20 really don't know what the jury thought about, for instance,  
21 potential noninfringing alternatives for any of the patents.  
22 We can speculate maybe some speculations are more likely  
23 than others, but we really don't know and therefore we need  
24 a new trial on damages.

25 Wasn't that what I articulated?

1                   MS. SMALLEY: Yes, Your Honor. But that doesn't,  
2 in my opinion, allow AVX to present new noninfringing  
3 alternatives to the '095 or the '715 patent. I mean it had  
4 noninfringing alternatives it presented at the first trial  
5 but this is new information that doesn't relate to the Court's  
6 grant of a new trial.

7                   THE COURT: All right. Well, even the cases you  
8 cite say that the Court has discretion to allow new opinions  
9 even though they could have been raised in connection with  
10 the earlier trial. Why shouldn't I at this point be  
11 exercising that discretion in that direction?

12                  MS. SMALLEY: Because that gives AVX an unfair  
13 advantage. The reason for the new trial was related to very  
14 specific things, the noninfringement verdict on the '715  
15 patent and the possibility of noninfringing alternatives of  
16 the '627 patent related to the Federal Circuit decision  
17 affirming the PTAB invalidation of those claims. I mean this  
18 in essence, if the Court were to allow new evidence, would  
19 give AVX a redo and a chance to improve its case after seeing  
20 Greatbatch's case.

21                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Let me hear from  
22 AVX on this motion, please.

23                  MR. CAHILL: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Ron  
24 Cahill on behalf of AVX.

25                  Your Honor, we believe that the Court's Order

1 didn't limit discovery in any way. That the Court correctly  
2 vacated the existing damages verdict and ordered a new trial.  
3 And that the facts on the ground changed between 2016 and  
4 2018.

5 Ms. Smalley mentioned the '715 patent. The  
6 last time we tried infringement on the '715 patent, there  
7 was an assumption that all Ingenio parts infringe, and that  
8 assumption doesn't exist anymore, and we know, in fact, that  
9 some of them don't. And, in fact, that contradicts some of  
10 the evidence and testimony that Greatbatch put on in 2016.

11 So the case now is a little bit different, and  
12 nowhere in Greatbatch's argument or briefing does one find  
13 any actual prejudice to Greatbatch. AVX presented its  
14 expert opinions according to the schedule that the Court set.  
15 Greatbatch responded to those expert reports according to the  
16 schedule that the Court set, provided something like a half  
17 a dozen more expert reports in response, and was able to  
18 take the depositions of the Greatbatch experts -- of the  
19 AVX experts. So there is no prejudice, there is no unfair  
20 advantage, and this is what we asked for when we moved the  
21 Court to vacate the damages verdict and it have a new trial.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

23 Ms. Smalley, do you want to reply?

24 MS. SMALLEY: Your Honor, the prejudice isn't the  
25 time in having our experts respond. We will have to use trial

1 time to rebut alternatives and other expert opinions that were  
2 not presented in the first trial, and because AVX is being  
3 permitted to develop new evidence that it could have developed  
4 before the first trial after seeing Greatbatch's case. I mean  
5 it lost the damages issues in the first case and now it gets  
6 to revise its theories having seen how trial played out.

7 Now, while we recognize that the Court did allow  
8 that to a certain extent due to the verdict on the '715  
9 patent and claim 12 of the '627 patent, we believe that this  
10 is an advantage beyond that provided by the Court's Order.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'm denying  
12 Greatbatch's motion. I did not place the limitations on  
13 expert discovery that Greatbatch suggests that I did or  
14 maybe should have. Instead, I have ordered a new trial on  
15 damages. I ordered a new period for expert discovery and  
16 expert reports. And there just was no point at which I  
17 imposed the limits on that discovery or opinions.

18 For instance, the limitation that if you could  
19 have come up with this noninfringing alternative prior to  
20 the first trial but you didn't, you can't -- that limitation  
21 just isn't anywhere in this case. There are other cases  
22 where such a limitation might be appropriate. In this  
23 case, in my view, it was not appropriate and at this point  
24 certainly is not appropriate. We vacated the damages award  
25 in part based on the verdict form that was used at the first

1 trial, and the failure of certain assumptions that were told  
2 to that jury based on subsequent events, those assumptions  
3 are no longer operative. So we need a new trial and AVX  
4 acted consistent with the letter and the spirit of the  
5 scheduling order here.

6 To the extent there is prejudice to Greatbatch,  
7 it's not unfair prejudice. Greatbatch has had every fair  
8 opportunity and I think has apparently taken advantage of  
9 them to respond in a timely manner to the new opinions.  
10 There is no evidence of bad faith. AVX's conduct is well  
11 explained in the record. This evidence is important. And  
12 there will be no impact on the trial for me allowing AVX to  
13 have done what it did, which is consistent with my order.

14 So for all those reasons, Greatbatch motion is  
15 denied.

16 Let's turn then to the AVX motion. AVX is  
17 seeking to strike certain Greatbatch expert opinions that it  
18 contends are contrary to the Court's construction of terms  
19 in claim 12 of the '627 patent. This one is AVX's motion,  
20 so let's hear from AVX first, please.

21 MR. CAHILL: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Ron  
22 Cahill for AVX.

23 First, I think it makes sense to talk a little  
24 bit about the claim construction. The Court took up claim  
25 construction in the context of the issue of indefiniteness

1 shortly before the 2016 trial. And at that point, the term  
2 "asymmetrical" had not been construed, and at the request of  
3 both parties, the Court construed it to mean "not symmetrical."

4 But the Court didn't stop there. The Court  
5 added two examples of capacitors that would be symmetrical.  
6 And one of them was a capacitor having a bisecting plane  
7 containing the line passing through the ground lead  
8 passageway wherein the bisecting plane creates a mirror  
9 image of non-ground lead passageways on either side of the  
10 bisecting planes.

11 AVX, through its expert reports, presented a  
12 series of noninfringing alternatives that fell squarely  
13 within that example of symmetrical that the Court provided.  
14 And therefore, those noninfringing alternatives cannot be  
15 asymmetrical. And this is obviously critical in the case  
16 because the only -- there claim 12 which AVX is accused of  
17 infringing requires an asymmetrical capacitor while claim 13  
18 which has been invalidated calls for a symmetrical capacitor.  
19 So if the capacitors are symmetrical, they are noninfringing.

20 Greatbatch doesn't argue that AVX's noninfringing  
21 alternatives fall outside of the Court's example of symmetrical  
22 so apparently they are symmetrical but they're also  
23 nonsymmetrical according to Greatbatch because of other  
24 features that don't appear anywhere in the Court's claim  
25 construction. So even though the noninfringing alternatives

1 fall squarely within the example of symmetrical, expert  
2 opinions from Greatbatch experts say they are asymmetrical,  
3 for example, because a ground electrode has a slightly  
4 different shape on the left than on the right. But that  
5 doesn't have anything to do with the example of symmetrical  
6 that the Court provided. An example that was based on the  
7 intrinsic evidence of the '627 patent.

8 Now, in other contexts, including the 2016  
9 trial, Greatbatch agreed that it was that extra passageway  
10 the hole for the RF pin, that it was that that determined  
11 whether the capacitor was symmetrical or asymmetrical.

12 In fact, Mr. Whetzel asked Greatbatch's expert  
13 during that trial: And if you didn't drill that hole, would  
14 the capacitor be symmetrical?

15 And the expert responded: That would change the  
16 symmetry. Yes.

17 Now, during a recent reexamination of the '627  
18 patent, here in the context of Greatbatch trying to preserve  
19 the validity of claim 12, Greatbatch told the Patent Office,  
20 according to the District Court construction of "symmetry,"  
21 to determine whether a filter capacitor is asymmetrical,  
22 there has to be an internal ground pin and the active  
23 terminal pins must not be symmetrical with respect to the  
24 internal ground pin.

25 So, again, Greatbatch is adopting this position

1       that it depends on where the pins are, not on anything else.  
2       And they do that to preserve the validity of claim 12.

3                   We think the construction that we put forth in our  
4       brief is the Court's construction. And that we have followed  
5       that construction using the English language and that  
6       Greatbatch at other times in this litigation has expressly  
7       agreed with that. And yet now they say it doesn't work.  
8       That even though the capacitor is symmetrical, their expert  
9       says it's asymmetrical.

10                  That works a tremendous prejudice to AVX because  
11       if they're allowed to say this at trial, then we have got  
12       to argue the claim construction to the jury. We have got to  
13       unravel all of this on both cross-examination and with our  
14       own experts, and that just isn't fair.

15                  THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cahill, a couple  
16       questions then.

17                  Are you taking the view that asymmetry is only  
18       evaluated with regard to the location of the passageways and  
19       not with respect to any other design features of the filter  
20       capacitors?

21                  MR. CAHILL: Well, Your Honor, I don't think we  
22       go that far because "asymmetrical" means "not symmetrical"  
23       and the Court has given an example of symmetrical based on  
24       the passageways. We fall within that example and so we're  
25       symmetrical in claim 13 and not asymmetrical in claim 12.

1       Whether there could be some different way to determine what  
2       is asymmetrical, I mean that is, it seems to us to be beside  
3       the point. The Court gave us an example of symmetrical, and  
4       we fall within that example.

5                     THE COURT: So in Greatbatch arguing against  
6       your position in this motion, they take me back to certain  
7       discussions we've had at least related to these issues in  
8       which they at least contend that I have said that the  
9       examples in connection with the construction of asymmetry  
10      in the summary judgment opinion, that those examples are  
11      just examples and they're not exhaustive. There may be  
12      other examples of symmetrical embodiments, for instance.

13                  If that is my view, can you still prevail on  
14      this motion?

15                  MR. CAHILL: Well, Your Honor, it doesn't matter  
16      how many examples of symmetry there are. We only have to  
17      meet one example of symmetry in order to be symmetrical.  
18      The capacitor can't be symmetrical and asymmetrical at  
19      the same time. So if we meet one example of symmetry, the  
20      capacitor is symmetrical. And, again, Greatbatch's expert  
21      has agreed with that proposition at other times in this  
22      litigation. And so if there were 1,000 examples of what is  
23      symmetrical, it wouldn't matter to this motion because we  
24      meet one of them.

25                  THE COURT: Now, I suppose, and we'll see if

1 Greatbatch is arguing this, but another way of looking at  
2 it might be that there is more to the filter capacitor, and  
3 so just because you meet this example with the mirror image  
4 and the pins, if the rest of the capacitor was something we  
5 would all indisputably agree is not symmetrical, it's  
6 asymmetrical, then I just didn't go far enough in explaining  
7 in my earlier opinion because it wasn't the arguments being  
8 made to me and, therefore, what I said was incomplete and  
9 you're sort of misinterpreting it. Why would that not be  
10 the correct conclusion here?

11 MR. CAHILL: Your Honor, I'd like to take that  
12 on in three parts.

13 The first is the Court's construction was based  
14 on examples in the '627 patent. And the specific example  
15 in the '627 patent that we're talking about is in column 9  
16 in the paragraph that starts at line 4 and it says: The  
17 conductive terminal pins are symmetrically positioned by the  
18 central ground pin. And that is an embodiment that we all  
19 agree is a symmetrical capacitor.

20 And so except that, I guess, Your Honor,  
21 except to the extent that we disagree, which we have noted  
22 consistently in our briefing, it's those pins that form the  
23 symmetry that makes it symmetrical.

24 Second, Greatbatch at several other times  
25 throughout this litigation has agreed completely with that

1 position, and they are changing what they're saying now  
2 because it suits their purpose now. When they were arguing,  
3 invalidity was in play, they have consistently said that  
4 it's about the pins or the holes, whichever one you pick.  
5 That is what defines the symmetry and asymmetry; and it's  
6 helpful found on validity, and now that the validity has  
7 been upheld, they shouldn't be allowed to change it.

8                   Then third, Your Honor, if it's the case that  
9 the Court thinks that the Court didn't go far enough and  
10 it is now going to change the claim construction, then that  
11 works incredible prejudice on AVX because our experts took  
12 the claim construction we had and specifically designed  
13 noninfringing alternatives to fit the example that the  
14 Court gave us. They could have done something else, if the  
15 claim construction had said something else. If the claim  
16 construction changes now, then we would need to update our  
17 expert reports.

18                   THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

19                   Let me give Greatbatch a chance. Go ahead, please.

20                   MR. MULDOON: That's my turn, Your Honor. This  
21 is Jim Muldoon.

22                   AVX clearly had notice of the issue with respect  
23 to the symmetry issues on the feedthrough filter capacitor.

24                   The claim language is not that the holes or the  
25 passageways are symmetrically distributed throughout the

1       capacitor, it is that the capacitor is asymmetrical. And  
2       the Court, at the motion to reargue claim construction, was  
3       very clear in its questions to AVX's counsel that it should  
4       be the capacitor as a whole, and AVX's counsel responded  
5       very clearly, yes, it is as a whole, that included the  
6       passageways as well as the plates.

7                 Additionally, at trial, when the issue popped  
8       up with respect to Professor Webster's testimony regarding  
9       symmetry of plates, there was a sidebar and the Court asked  
10      AVX's counsel very specifically whether or not the order  
11      was limited or that there weren't other ways to measure  
12      symmetry. And, again, AVX's counsel acknowledged that the  
13      claim construction order was not limited solely to the  
14      passageways.

15               With respect to the USPTO and the reexamination,  
16      there was clear -- just as the Court expressly found at oral  
17      argument that there was no disclaimer in the prosecution  
18      history, the PTO found no disclaimer and used the plain  
19      meaning of the word "asymmetrical," taken right out of a  
20      dictionary which is essentially identical with the Court's  
21      meaning and construction.

22               The fact that AVX chose to have its experts  
23      opine on a theory that Dr. Hillman actually admitted in his  
24      deposition testimony a few weeks ago that he is limiting  
25      his claim construction or his interpretation of the Court's

1 claim construction to be limited solely to the passageways.

2 We have included the images in our briefing  
3 where there are extensive protrusions on one side of the  
4 capacitor body that are not there on the other. There are  
5 protrusions in the plates on one side that are not there on  
6 the other. And we don't believe that there is any way that  
7 those now new hypothetical alternatives that never existed  
8 during the accounting period can be called hypothetical --  
9 I'm sorry -- asymmetrical.

10 We disagree with AVX's counsel's twisting out  
11 of context statements of Dr. Pilgrim that he has said that  
12 these are symmetrical or that he admitted that you don't  
13 look at the capacitor as a whole in determining symmetry.

14 These are new alternatives that were for the  
15 first time disclosed in the defendant's responding expert  
16 reports on September 11th; and it is only fair that  
17 Greatbatch's experts in their reply reports got a chance  
18 to opine on these new hypothetical alternatives that were  
19 only disclosed then.

20 This is an issue that the Court has already  
21 raised and clarified in its motion hearings at trial; and we  
22 do not believe that claim construction -- that asymmetrical  
23 is not symmetrical is inappropriate in any way. There is no  
24 disclaimer that has been the plain meaning of the term that  
25 everybody has learned since their second grade math sheets

1 of looking at symmetrical and asymmetrical devices. Therefore,  
2 the motion to strike should be denied.

3 THE COURT: All right. I need some further  
4 assistance, Mr. Muldoon.

5 So I'm looking at some of the images that you  
6 provided, for instance, at page 4 of your letter brief which  
7 I think has depictions of what I understand to be I think  
8 all six of the noninfringing alternatives according to the  
9 new report.

10 If we focus on the four towards the upper end  
11 of the page as opposed to the two on the bottom of the page  
12 -- are you with me?

13 MR. MULDOON: Yes, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. So on those four, for any of  
15 them, and I don't know if the analysis is different on them,  
16 do any of them have a bisecting plane containing the line  
17 passing through the ground lead passageway wherein the  
18 bisecting plane creates a mirror image of non-ground lead  
19 passageways on either side of the bisecting plane?

20 MR. MULDOON: Your Honor, that is exemplary  
21 language. Okay. The holes are evenly distributed around  
22 the ground pin, Your Honor. That does not indicate that  
23 the capacitor as a whole is symmetrical.

24 THE COURT: Okay. But that is a "yes," right?

25 All four of them do meet that language that I just read from

1 the summary judgment order; correct?

2 MR. MULDOON: I don't remember if it was a  
3 summary judgment order or the claim construction. Yes,  
4 Your Honor. That those distributions of one feature of the  
5 capacitor are symmetrically distributed. However, the  
6 other features of the capacitor which counsel has admitted  
7 on diversification the plates are clearly not symmetrical.

8 THE COURT: So to be clear, DI 546, at page 23,  
9 it was the summary judgment opinion, and that is where we  
10 were asked to, and did, construe "asymmetry." And so the  
11 sentence I'm reading to you from says: As illustrated in  
12 embodiments of the '627 patent, "symmetrical" means, for  
13 example ... and then I read to you the first example.

14 So it seems to me that you have agreed that one  
15 or more, probably all four of these examples do satisfy what  
16 the Court said in describing "symmetrical." Am I correct  
17 about that?

18 MR. MULDOON: Your Honor, clearly the argument  
19 at the time was focused on one particular feature of the  
20 capacitor. There, the passageways, since there was obviously  
21 five on one side and four on the other or six on one side and  
22 five on the other. Merely focusing on one feature does not  
23 make the entirety of the device symmetrical.

24 THE COURT: Okay. But still, and we'll get  
25 there, at this point I think you have to agree that what I

1       said is an example of symmetrical is satisfied by those four  
2       examples that AVX has come up with; correct?

3                    MR. MULDOON: Your Honor, since those examples  
4       are taken from the examples that are expressly named  
5       "symmetrical" in the patent, Figures 1 through 6, and the  
6       circular one, there are other features of those capacitors,  
7       the shape of the capacitor, the location of the pins being  
8       equidistant from the ground pin, that is, do these meet the  
9       limitation if we focus solely on the ground pins and ignore  
10      all other features of the capacitor? Yes, Your Honor.

11                  THE COURT: Now, if those devices meet the  
12      definition of "symmetrical," do you agree that that means  
13      they cannot be asymmetrical?

14                  MR. MULDOON: No, Your Honor.

15                  THE COURT: So I think I know why you are saying  
16      that. And I will give you a chance to explain, but is it your  
17      position that a device can be symmetrical and asymmetrical at  
18      the same time?

19                  MR. MULDOON: Where a device is asked, the  
20      symmetry has to be measured of the capacitor as a whole,  
21      Your Honor, the Court should look at all of the features  
22      of the capacitor, including the shape of the body and the  
23      ground plates which are explicitly part of the capacitor  
24      and described as such in I believe it is column 7 of the  
25      patents in the upper third of that column where it talks

1 about the capacitor being a monolithic ceramic capacitor  
2 having passageways, plates, and a dielectric ceramic that  
3 surrounds the plates. And when a capacitor should be  
4 symmetrical, it should be all of those features that are  
5 symmetrical.

6 Now, we do not -- there can be, Your Honor --  
7 just because the headlights on a car are symmetrically  
8 placed doesn't mean that there isn't a single steering  
9 wheel and accelerator and brake medal in the car. So just  
10 by looking at one feature and saying that feature is  
11 symmetrical does not make the entirety of the device  
12 symmetrical.

13 THE COURT: Right. What I'm understanding  
14 from that is it is possible if you just are looking at the  
15 placement and number of the pins, it is possible that that  
16 is symmetrical where at the same moment in time, the overall  
17 feedthrough filter capacitor is asymmetrical. Is that what  
18 you are saying?

19 MR. MULDOON: Absolutely, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. But then I guess the  
21 question becomes, in the patent, there is all this discussion  
22 of the examples where we're only looking at the relative  
23 number and, you know, placement of the pins. You all, it  
24 seems to me, have advocated a position that that is a way  
25 to measure symmetry.

1                   The literal words of my opinion that I have read  
2 to you seem to say that that is a way to measure symmetry,  
3 and now you are asking me to say something different than  
4 that, it seems. So help me with that.

5                   MR. MULDOON: Well, it is not any different,  
6 Your Honor, than what the Court has already said with  
7 respect to that there aren't other ways, there aren't other  
8 ways to measure symmetry at the motion to reargue and during  
9 the trial.

10                  It is not that you're -- yes, there was a focus  
11 clearly on the location and number of the passageways because  
12 that was a feature that was obviously asymmetric as the jury  
13 found given that there were more holes on one side than the  
14 other, but just because we focused on one asymmetrical feature  
15 doesn't mean that there are not other asymmetrical features  
16 of the capacitor as a whole that still makes the capacitor  
17 asymmetrical.

18                  THE COURT: So every comment where you said,  
19 for instance, to the PTAB, this is the way the District  
20 Court says to measure it, to measure symmetry. This is what  
21 you do, you look at the pins or the passageways. All of  
22 those should be understood in context as that is what you  
23 were saying because that was the narrow dispute, but had  
24 you really been asked, you would have said that is just  
25 one place to look because it's easy. It's really, there

1       is plenty of places you could look for asymmetry.

2                   MR. MULDOON: Of the capacitor as a whole, yes,  
3 Your Honor. There was the arguments and the I believe it's  
4 4,700 and-some-odd pages of the prosecution history -- of  
5 the reexamination, I'm sorry, contain a number of arguments  
6 with respect to what standard the Court should, I'm sorry,  
7 the PTO should apply given the trial and the short term of  
8 the patent remaining, but none of those were relied on by  
9 the PTO.

10                  The PTO, as the Court did, found no disclaimer  
11 and chose a plain meaning of symmetrical, sorry, of  
12 "asymmetrical" essentially as the Court did in its initial  
13 first sentence of its language that "asymmetrical" is "not  
14 symmetrical."

15                  THE COURT: Is there anywhere in the patent  
16 I can look to to see that the measure of symmetry or  
17 asymmetry is not limited to the placement of the pins or  
18 the passageways?

19                  MR. MULDOON: Well, the language in the patent  
20 I believe, I do not have a copy in front of me, Your Honor,  
21 references that the capacitor is -- and it refers to the  
22 capacitor in the first embodiments in Figures 1 to 6 which  
23 is a rectangular capacitor with two equally spaced active  
24 pins and passageways on either side.

25                  The capacitor is also rectangular, and the pin

1       is clearly in the center of the rectangle, and the pins are  
2       along the same major axis of that rectangle. As the patent  
3       refers to that capacitor and that embodiment as symmetrical,  
4       there are numerous features of that embodiment including the  
5       ground plate, including the active plates, including the  
6       shape of the capacitor, and the distribution of the ceramic  
7       material around the capacitor being --

8                  MS. SMALLEY: Yes, column 4. I'm sorry, Jim.

9                  Column 4, line 27 said: Various embodiments of  
10       the invention are disclosed herein which illustrate that the  
11       feedthrough filter capacitor may be asymmetrical as well as  
12       symmetrical about the ground lead.

13                 So there are two separate concepts. There is  
14       symmetry of the capacitor and then being symmetrical around  
15       the ground lead.

16                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that, Ms. Smalley.

17                 Mr. Muldoon or Ms. Smalley, either one, what  
18       defendant posits, if I do as you say and deny this motion,  
19       is that this trial is going to essentially be in large part  
20       a claim construction hearing in front of the jury and that  
21       that will be improper and confusing. Respond to that concern.

22                 MR. MULDOON: Your Honor, we believe that the  
23       claim construction that the jury should receive is that  
24       asymmetrical is not symmetrical and not include the exemplary  
25       language that was put in at a time when the focus was on only

1 one of the asymmetric features of that device.

2 THE COURT: And therefore what happens to the  
3 opinions that these devices we have been looking at here  
4 on page 4 of your letter are noninfringing alternatives?

5 MR. MULDOON: Well, clearly, Your Honor, with  
6 respect to the plates, we have testimony from Dr. Hillman  
7 that the plates are not the same on the left side as they  
8 are on the right side, the distance between the setoff of  
9 the plates to the edge of the capacitor, the overall shape  
10 of the capacitor body are not symmetrical.

11 We believe that that is an issue that we'll be  
12 addressing with respect to *Daubert* issues because we believe  
13 that as Dr. Webster testified, that is at page 1580 of his  
14 transcript, talking about plates being considered in  
15 symmetry, as the Court has already raised another concept,  
16 they had notice of these issues with respect to plates, and  
17 we believe that all of their embodiments are not the same on  
18 the right as the left and therefore not symmetrical and not  
19 noninfringing.

20 THE COURT: Right. Okay. But just to be clear,  
21 what you propose is that I would tell the jury asymmetry  
22 is not symmetrical and then let their expert present these  
23 six noninfringing alternatives and your expert explain why  
24 he thinks you need to take a broader perspective as to the  
25 overall capacitor and that they are infringing because they

1       are asymmetrical. Is that what you are saying?

2                    MR. MULDOON: Yes, Your Honor. That is very  
3       consistent with the language of *Grain Processing* where there  
4       is no noninfringing alternative that was actually on the  
5       market. That raises an inference that puts a burden on the  
6       defendant to show that there were noninfringing alternatives  
7       available, and we will show why each of these designs is not  
8       symmetrical.

9                    THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?

10                  MR. MULDOON: And that is what the expert  
11       opinions they are trying to exclude would do, as we say.

12                  THE COURT: Anything else from Greatbatch then?

13                  MR. MULDOON: No, Your Honor.

14                  THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cahill, you can  
15       respond.

16                  MR. CAHILL: Sure, Your Honor. There is a lot  
17       to respond to, but I think what I would like to do is to go  
18       to the very end.

19                  The solution that Greatbatch proposes would  
20       radically change the claim construction in this case. And  
21       if that were to happen, we would seek to propound new expert  
22       reports that follow the new claim construction, and we  
23       could have proposed other noninfringing alternatives had the  
24       claim construction been different, and we didn't do that.  
25       We followed the claim construction that we had and we stayed

1       within the Court's Orders.

2                     Second, we would seek leave to vacate the jury  
3                     verdict from 2016 with respect to the '627 patent. We tried  
4                     validity in this case based on that claim construction and  
5                     now Greatbatch seeks to broaden it.

6                     Third, we would go back to the Patent Office  
7                     with a new claim construction and invalidate the '627 patent  
8                     there as well. Because, again, the Patent Office was  
9                     looking at very different representations from Greatbatch  
10                    when it found claim 12 valid. I submit that the Court  
11                    cannot change the claim construction now without having us  
12                    go through all of those exercises.

13                  THE COURT: Well, what about the argument  
14                  that it's not a claim -- it's not a change in the claim  
15                  construction, it's just you all were focused on the placement  
16                  of the pins and the passageways have been for years here and  
17                  in the PTO evidently, and so I addressed the dispute that you  
18                  had but never said or suggested that the measure ultimately  
19                  of whether there is symmetry is at the level of the overall  
20                  capacitor?

21                  MR. CAHILL: Your Honor, that is just not what  
22                  the order says. So the order gives examples of symmetrical,  
23                  and we clearly fall within one of the examples of symmetrical.  
24                  And then it says "asymmetrical" means "not symmetrical."

25                  I mean logically it is impossible for our

1 noninfringing alternatives to be asymmetrical under these  
2 circumstances. It's logically impossible.

3 THE COURT: Well, let's break that down. Why  
4 isn't it that at the same moment in time, your alternatives  
5 can have placements of pins and passageways that meet our  
6 definition of "symmetry" but be placed on an overall  
7 capacitor that itself is asymmetrical?

8 MR. CAHILL: Well, Your Honor, if "asymmetrical"  
9 means "not symmetrical," once you find symmetry, then it  
10 can't be asymmetrical. I mean a capacitor can't be  
11 symmetrical and asymmetrical at the same time.

12 THE COURT: Right. But the capacitor --

13 MR. CAHILL: It can if you want to revisit  
14 indefiniteness.

15 THE COURT: Understood. But the capacitor can  
16 be asymmetrical and have a component, maybe the most  
17 important component, that is symmetrical, can't it?

18 MR. CAHILL: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I'm not  
19 sure I followed that.

20 THE COURT: The placement of the pins and  
21 passageways can be symmetrical on an overall capacitor that  
22 could -- we could give it a random shape, but would be  
23 indisputably the overall shape could be asymmetrical. Isn't  
24 that possible?

25 MR. CAHILL: I don't think it is possible as a

1 matter of claim construction. The intrinsic evidence is  
2 clear, symmetry and asymmetry is defined by the placement of  
3 the pins with respect to the ground lead.

4 THE COURT: What about --

5 MR. CAHILL: That has always been.

6 THE COURT: What about column 4, line 27 that  
7 Ms. Smalley read to us from the patent?

8 MR. CAHILL: Well, that doesn't tell us much of  
9 something about what is symmetrical versus asymmetrical or  
10 whether it's the pins or anything else.

11 THE COURT: Doesn't it suggest that the FFT may  
12 be asymmetrical as well as symmetrical around the ground  
13 leads?

14 MR. CAHILL: I don't think it does. I think  
15 it says that the filter feedthrough capacitor can be  
16 asymmetrical or it can be symmetrical and either one of  
17 those is about the ground lead. And I understand that to  
18 be the way the Court has construed the claim.

19 In other words, I think "about the ground lead"  
20 modifies "asymmetrical" as well as "symmetrical." Otherwise,  
21 you would have a feedthrough filter capacitor that was both  
22 symmetrical and asymmetrical, in which case I really want to  
23 go back to our indefiniteness argument.

24 THE COURT: Well, take Mr. Muldoon's car  
25 example. If you are looking at it from the front and just

1 focus on the perspective of the headlights, the headlights  
2 let's just stipulate are placed symmetrically vis-à-vis the  
3 front perspective, but if we go and ask is the car overall  
4 symmetrical or, if you are sitting in the driver's seat, you  
5 know, are there two symmetrical steering wheels, we know  
6 that there are not.

7 Why isn't this analogous to that, a component,  
8 the component we have been focused on for five years or  
9 so, is perhaps symmetrical but the overall vehicle, the  
10 capacitor, can at the same moment be asymmetrical?

11 MR. CAHILL: Well, Your Honor, we've defined  
12 symmetry in the capacitor by the only features that matter,  
13 the only features that appear in the patent, in the file  
14 history that have been the subject of argument for more  
15 than four years now. And if you want to argue about whether  
16 the car is asymmetrical, the car is asymmetrical and the  
17 headlights are symmetrical.

18 Here, we have defined symmetry in the capacitor by  
19 the only features that actually matter for symmetry purposes  
20 because both the patent and the file history makes it clear  
21 that the difference with asymmetry is because you place the  
22 pins differently, you wind up with different impedance. That  
23 has nothing to do with the shape of the ceramic on the outside.  
24 It has to do with where you place the pins.

25 And we have been making these arguments for more

1 than four years now, and there has never been a suggestion  
2 anywhere that it is anything other than the placement of the  
3 pins that tells you whether the capacitor is symmetry or  
4 asymmetry.

5 So it is not like the car example. If you said  
6 the only thing in the car is that matters is the headlights,  
7 then I think the car is symmetrical.

8 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else,  
9 Mr. Cahill?

10 MR. CAHILL: No, thank you, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Muldoon, anything  
12 you wanted to add?

13 MR. MULDOON: Just to request the Court's  
14 attention that the underlying sentence from the pretrial  
15 arguments where you clearly asked whether it was with  
16 respect to the capacitor as a whole, and the response quoted  
17 is as a whole, Your Honor, as described and claimed in the  
18 patent references to plates and passageways.

19 THE COURT: Right. Thank you.

20 MR. CAHILL: Your Honor, if I could respond to  
21 that?

22 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

23 MR. CAHILL: That is completely out of context.  
24 The dispute at that time was whether the hole for the RF pin  
25 was part of the capacitor. And AVX argued that it wasn't

1 because it was completely outside of the other capacitor  
2 features. That is why that argument was worded the way it  
3 was worded.

4 THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you all. I  
5 think this is a very difficult motion and a difficult  
6 situation here. AVX is moving to strike these opinions of  
7 Greatbatch's experts on the grounds that Greatbatch's  
8 experts opinions are directly contrary to the Court's claim  
9 construction.

10 I think, while this is a very close call,  
11 ultimately I am siding with Greatbatch on this and I am  
12 denying AVX motion. I don't deny what AVX is saying that  
13 some of these, if not all of these, alleged noninfringing  
14 alternatives meet the literal language of "symmetry" in an  
15 example that I gave in my opinion construing asymmetry; the  
16 summary judgment opinion, that is.

17 I don't deny that some or all of these alleged  
18 noninfringing alternatives meet the literal language of what  
19 I said in that order. I also don't deny that we derived  
20 that language and those examples from the intrinsic evidence.  
21 Specifically, the patent itself.

22 It's also true that the focus of much of the  
23 litigation over this patent has been on the relative placement  
24 of the pins and passageways and the capacitors and the  
25 plaintiff has said all the things that the defendant says that

1 the plaintiff has said.

2                   Nonetheless, I believe and hope I have been  
3 consistent that the ultimate measure of symmetry or asymmetry  
4 is not necessarily the placement of the pins and the  
5 passageways. It is ultimately a measure of the overall  
6 capacitor itself.

7                   Just because we have spent a lot of time and  
8 energy and no doubt money litigating the placement of the  
9 pins and the passageways because Greatbatch thought it  
10 could prove asymmetry at that level doesn't mean that they  
11 couldn't have at that time and more importantly can't now  
12 try to prove asymmetry at another level, i.e., at the  
13 totality of the overall capacitor.

14                  I think there is support in the statements that  
15 I have made that Greatbatch has pointed to for that view.  
16 I think there is at least some intrinsic support for that  
17 view, including in column 4, line 27 that Ms. Smalley  
18 helpfully called out here on the call today.

19                  So the end result of that is I'm not striking  
20 what Greatbatch's expert has opined about these noninfringing  
21 alternatives. I'm also not striking the opinion of AVX's  
22 expert that they are in fact noninfringing alternatives.

23                  I will do my best at trial not to let this  
24 devolve into an improper claim construction hearing in front  
25 of the jury. I'll need some help from the parties in the

1 pretrial order, pretrial conference and at trial to help me  
2 make sure that doesn't happen. But I think that ultimately  
3 you have all hit upon a genuine dispute of fact that both  
4 sides experts can opine on, and we'll get the jury's view  
5 ultimately on it.

6 I have considered the *Pennypack* Factors. I  
7 don't think they really play a big role here. Really, the  
8 substance of the motion turns on whether I think what the  
9 plaintiff has done is inconsistent or directly contrary  
10 with my construction, and therefore I don't think what I'm  
11 ruling is blessing Greatbatch for acting in bad faith or  
12 trying to confuse the jury. I think what Greatbatch has  
13 done is timely. They are responding to timely disclosed  
14 opinions of AVX's experts.

15 I don't think this needs to have any impact on  
16 the trial date. And I see no basis to grant the alternative  
17 relief that AVX requested of yet more expert opinions and  
18 more expert discovery or claim construction briefing or  
19 revising an indefiniteness defense.

20 Everyone has the schedule. I have found today  
21 everyone acted consistent with the schedule, everyone acted  
22 consistent with my claim construction, and we're going to  
23 have a trial at which both sides will have a full and fair  
24 opportunity to present their cases. So the motion is denied.

25 Any questions about that, Mr. Cahill?

1                   MR. CAHILL: Well, Your Honor, I was going to  
2 ask for five business days to provide a new expert report.  
3 It sounds like you already denied it.

4                   THE COURT: Well, if Greatbatch wants to agree  
5 to it, I'll change my mind but, Mr. Muldoon, do you want to  
6 agree to that?

7                   MR. MULDOON: At this point, no, Your Honor.  
8 But we'll be happy to continue discussions with counsel off  
9 the record.

10                  THE COURT: Yes, why don't you all discuss that.  
11 I certainly don't mean to say, Mr. Cahill, that you all can't  
12 agree to further share your positions with one another,  
13 including through more expert disclosures.

14                  I do really need your help to make sure that we  
15 don't turn this into one long claim construction hearing. And  
16 it may well be that you all being as thorough in disclosing to  
17 one another what it is you propose to do as possible will help  
18 me in that regard. So I may have been a little too quick in  
19 saying no further expert disclosures, but I'm going to leave  
20 it to you all to discuss that first.

21                  Anything else, Mr. Cahill?

22                  MR. CAHILL: No, Your Honor.

23                  THE COURT: And Mr. Muldoon?

24                  MR. MULDOON: No, Your Honor.

25                  THE COURT: I hope you all have a nice

1 Thanksgiving. Thanks very much. Good-bye.

2 (Telephone conference ends at 3:48 p.m.)

3

I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.

5

6

7

8

8

8

1

- 1 -

2

23

24

25

/s/ Brian P. Gaffigan  
Official Court Reporter  
U.S. District Court